REMARKS

Claims 47-68 are in this case.

The new set of claims is patentable for the same reason as the other set. New claims 58, 63 and 65 to 68 limit the scope of claim 47 to specific types of machines that are different than the machines set forth in Howson.

Howson el al does not even use any radiology imaging machines. In fact, Howson's machine does not take a picture of anything.

Even if the combination of Howson, Dorne and Prince is made it does not meet the claims of applicant, neither Howson, Dorne nor Prince teach a predetermined series of steps of the operator of a medical machine nor place the individual series of steps of the operator of a medical machine into the computer and therefore has nothing to do with the present invention.

Even if the combination of Howson , Dorne and Prince is made they do not do what the present invention does.

MPEP Sec. 2143.03 says quote:

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royke,* 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."

The claims in this case are different in scope from the claims in the parent application.